

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

Technical Committee Minutes
for meeting of

February 1, 2013

**TPB TECHNICAL COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND ALTERNATES
ATTENDANCE - February 1, 2013**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DDOT Mark Rawlings
 Anthony Foster
DCOP -----

MARYLAND

Charles County -----
Frederick Co. Ron Burns
City of Frederick Tim Davis
Gaithersburg -----
Montgomery Co. Gary Erenrich
Prince George's Co. Vic Weissberg
Rockville -----
M-NCPPC
 Montgomery Co. -----
 Prince George's Co. -----
MDOT Lyn Erickson
 Vaughn Lewis
MTA -----
Takoma Park -----

VIRGINIA

Alexandria Pierre Holloman
Arlington Co. Dan Malouff
City of Fairfax Alexis Verzosa
Fairfax Co. Mike Lake
Falls Church -----
Loudoun Co. Robert Brown
Manassas -----
Prince William Co. Monica Backmon
NVTC Claire Gron
PRTC Cynthia Porter-Johnson
VRE -----
VDOT Valerie Pardo
VDRPT Amy Inman
NVPDC -----
VDOA -----

WMATA

WMATA Mark Kellogg

FEDERAL/OTHER

FHWA-DC -----
FHWA-VA -----
FTA Melissa Barlow
NCPC -----
NPS -----
MWAQC -----

COG Staff

Ron Kirby, DTP
Gerald Miller, DTP
Elena Constantine, DTP
Andrew Austin, DTP
Wendy Klancher, DTP
Mark Pfoutz, DTP
Robert Griffiths, DTP
Ron Milone, DTP
Jane Posey, DTP
Andrew Meese, DTP
John Swanson, DTP
Mark Moran, DTP
Wenjing Pu, DTP
Nicholas Ramfos, DTP
Michael Farrell, DTP
Beth Newman, DTP
Daivamani Sivasailam, DTP
William Bacon, DTP
Feng Xie, DTP
Andy Meese, DTP
Sarah Crawford, DTP
Karin Foster, DTP
Sunil Kumar, DEP
Paul DesJardin, DCPS

Other Attendees

Bill Orleans, HACK

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BOARD

February 1, 2013

Technical Committee Minutes

1. **Welcome and Approval of Minutes from January 11 TPB Technical Committee Meeting**

Minutes were approved as written.

2. **Updates on Project Submissions for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP**

Mr. Austin stated that the project submissions were released for public comment on January 17th and that a presentation on the significant additions and changes had been presented to the TPB and to the Access for All Advisory Committee. He said that staff from VDOT had submitted a technical correction to the project submissions; the removal of a planned segment of auxiliary lanes on I-495 between Heming Ave. and one mile east of the I-95/395/495 interchange was incorrect and that project is continuing as scheduled. Mr. Austin also stated he was working with staff from VDOT to get revised cost information on the widening of a portion of HOT Lanes on I-495 in order to respond to a question from Mr. Zimmerman at the January TPB meeting.

Ms. Posey distributed updated copies of the Air Quality Conformity Inputs. Mr. Austin asked Committee members to review and submit any further technical corrections by February 8. He added that the TPB was scheduled to approve the project inputs at their February meeting.

Chair Erickson asked if any comments had been received. Mr. Austin said a few comments had come in, but nothing to date that would require any significant response. Mr. Kirby noted that a few letters had been received in support of projects in Virginia.

3. **Update on Draft Scope of Work for the Air Quality Conformity Assessment for the 2013 CLRP and the FY 2013-2018 TIP**

Ms. Posey indicated that since she had gone over the scope of work at the last meeting, she would not go over it again. She noted that the scope had been presented to the TPB at its January meeting, and that the schedule calls for a completion of the analysis in June and a TPB adoption of the TIP, CLRP and conformity analysis in July.

Mr. Kirby noted that there will be updated land use for this conformity analysis, Round 8.2. The COG Board approval of the Round 8.2 Cooperative Forecasts in July is linked with the TPB approval of the CLRP and TIP. It is important to have the land use and

transportation inputs coordinated. Updates are expected in the Tyson's area and Loudoun County near US 50 and VA 606, amongst others. There will be a "Cooperative Forecasting 101" session at the Planning Directors meeting in March. Mr. Kirby suggested that perhaps an overview of the cooperative forecasting process could be given to the Tech Committee and TPB as well.

Mr. Erenrich suggested that it would be helpful to have a visual representation of the land use data, and that the transportation group could let the planning directors know of any suggested updates.

Mr. Kirby reminded the group that it is important that the cooperative forecasts reflect what is most likely to happen, not what someone would like to happen.

Mr. Malouff indicated that Mr. Zimmerman might express concerns about the Arlington forecasts and the forecasting process.

Chair Erickson suggested that anyone concerned with forecasts should communicate with their Planning Director group representative.

Mr. Griffiths noted that it is important to distinguish between short term and long term trends.

Mr. Desjardin stated that the cooperative forecasting is a deliberative process with annual updates, and an effort is made to have the data as accurate as possible. Longer term forecasts are guided by comprehensive plans and policies.

Mr. Erenrich pointed out that master plans are not constrained.

Mr. Malouff suggested that some counties could overstate growth.

Mr. Kirby explained that it is a cooperative/ collaborative process, not just a stapling together of different county data.

Chair Erickson asked if a presentation about the cooperative forecasting process would be made to the TPB in February.

Mr. Kirby said that it would be better to present to TPB after there is a presentation for the planning directors.

Mr. Griffiths reminded the group that the jurisdictional totals for Round 8.2 have been approved, and any updates to those totals should be made in the next cycle, or the conformity schedule would be affected.

4. Update on the Implementation of the New Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program under MAP-21 in the Washington Region

Ms. Klancher provided an update to the Committee on the implementation of MAP-21's Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility program in the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area and discussions on the TPB staff proposal for a joint designated recipient between COG, MTA, DRPT and DDOT. MAP-21 eliminated the JARC program, and consolidated the old Section 5310 and New Freedom programs under SAFTEA-LU into the new Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility program. She stated that the new Enhanced Mobility program provides one allocation in the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area and will provide approximately \$2.6 million annually in Federal funds for grants that support transportation for people with disabilities and older adults. The TPB will be asked in February to amend the FY2013 UPWP to include staff activities to facilitate the implementation of the new Enhanced Mobility Program. She also described the January 24 meeting that TPB staff and Mr. Wojahn, as Chair of the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force, facilitated with MTA, DRPT, DDOT and WMATA to discuss a draft Memorandum of Understanding for a joint designated recipient agreement. The Draft MOU is under review by MTA, DRPT and DDOT.

Ms. Barlow asked that the memo that goes to the TPB specify how regional projects can be funded and how they would be administered. She also asked if the Human Service Transportation Plan would need to be updated prior to the solicitation for the new Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility funds. Ms. Klancher stated that the current Coordinated Plan includes strategies and selection criteria that could be used for the first solicitation of the Enhanced Mobility funds but that the Human Service Transportation Coordination Task Force would review the plan and provide guidance on any necessary updates.

Mr. Burns asked for clarification on the geographic area that the enhanced mobility funds could be spent in. Ms. Klancher replied that the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area Enhanced Mobility funds can be used for projects with trips that end or begin in the Urbanized Area shown on the map provided in the memo.

Mr. Weissberg asked what happens if a projects proposed service area include both large urbanized and small urbanized areas, and Ms. Klancher stated that the project sponsor could apply for both the metropolitan/large urbanized area "pot" and the State funding "pot" in that case.

Mr. Erenrich commented that he would like to see the TPB staff be involved in reporting and evaluation of the Enhanced Mobility projects under a joint designated recipient agreement. Ms. Klancher replied that under the joint designated recipient proposal, COG/TPB would not utilize any of the program administration funding that is available and therefore would not have a budget for evaluation, but staff could

summarize existing information that the state agencies would receive in the milestone reports.

Mr. Erenrich asked if WMATA would be conducting a competitive selection process for job access and reverse commute projects since MAP-21 added some funding to the Section 5307 apportionment for these purposes.

Ms. Klancher replied that there is no requirement that transit agencies solicit for projects, and that many transit agencies across the U.S. will not solicit for outside job access or reverse commute projects.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern that funds available to local governments are less and less, and that a project solicitation for JARC types of projects should be conducted. Mr. Kirby replied that the responsibility and funds for job access and reverse commute shifts to WMATA under MAP-21.

Chair Erickson asked for clarification about how the JARC funds were allocated in the past, and Ms. Klancher affirmed that JARC funding was allocated to the Washington DC-VA-MD Urbanized Area under SAFETEA-LU, but MAP-21 eliminates the JARC program entirely.

Mr. Erenrich stated that he was under the impression that there had been more JARC projects proposed than the funding allowed for and that WMATA should be aware that some projects under JARC will now no longer be eligible for Federal funds.

Ms. Barlow stated that Federal rules do not allow non-profits to apply for Section 5307 funds.

Mr. Kellog said that although the Metro Board could choose to do so, he would be surprised if Metro would run a competitive grant program using some 5307 money, similar to what TPB does with JARC and New Freedom.

Ms. Barlow stated that transit agencies need the Section 5307 funds in light of growing costs and shrinking budgets.

Mr. Erenrich commented that accessibility improvements have been very important for local governments.

Mr. Malouff asked if the Regional Bus Subcommittee had been briefed on this topic and Ms. Klancher stated that they had not.

5. Update on the Implementation of the New Transportation Alternatives Program under MAP-21 in the Washington Region

Mr. Swanson briefed the Committee on the new Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), which is a formula program established under the new federal reauthorization bill known as MAP-21. He reminded the Committee that the TPB will be responsible for a sub-allocation of TAP funds in each state in our region. He explained that staff has been in discussions with the state DOTs to determine how the program will be established in our three-state region

Mr. Brown asked how much funding will be available.

Mr. Swanson said that per year, the sub allocation for our region is expected to be as follows: \$1.6 million for Maryland, \$2.5-2.6 million for Virginia, and less than \$1 million for D.C.

Ms. Backmon asked how the selection panel would be chosen.

Mr. Swanson said the panel would be an impartial group of local- and national-level experts. He said the state DOTs would be included in the panel and would be involved in vetting applicants for eligibility and readiness.

Mr. Weissberg asked for more information about the workshop that will be conducted to brief potential applicants.

Mr. Swanson said that at least one workshop would be conducted, probably at COG. Details have not been determined.

Chair Erickson noted that for Maryland, the application process and process would be conducted jointly for statewide and regional sub allocated funds. She emphasized that the state DOTs would review projects for eligibility.

Mr. Swanson said that for FY 2014 in Virginia, the state and TPB would conduct separate solicitations.

6. Briefing on MAP-21 Requirements for Performance Based Planning and Programming

Mr. Kirby spoke to a PowerPoint on the Performance-Based Planning and Programming (PBPP) requirements under MAP-21. He began with the MAP-21 National Goals and Performance Management Measures Declaration of Policy that "Performance management will provide a means to the most efficient investment of Federal

transportation funds by refocusing on national transportation goals...and improving project decision making through performance-based planning and programming.” He reviewed the new National Goals from MAP-21 and how they are similar to the existing Scope of the Metropolitan Planning Process. He reviewed the PBPP Implementation Timeline and responsibilities.

Mr. Kirby noted some PBPP coordination efforts underway, such as the January 8th FHWA Performance Management Listening Session on Target Setting with state DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs via national video conference. Additionally, both AASHTO and AMPO have submitted letters to DOT with recommendations on how the PBPP should be carried out. Both letters addressed the concern that the PBPP should rely on existing data. He also noted that the PBPP process brings new requirements for states, transit agencies, and MPOs and these additional responsibilities must be completed under the same budget levels for MPOs. He concluded with some questions for attendees to consider as the PBPP process moves forward.

Mr. Brown asked about the sub regional county-level requirements for carrying out the PBPP. Mr. Kirby replied that the responsible agencies are the DOTs, transit agencies, and MPOs.

Ms. Barlow noted that American Public Transportation Association (APTA) was involved in the national conversation on performance measures. Mr. Kirby noted that he had not heard about a formal communication from APTA, such as the AASHTO and AMPO letters.

Mr. Erenrich expressed concern about a level planning field and that the report on performance could impact funding.

Ms. Backmon asked if the performance measures were going to be the same for the Regional Transportation Priorities Plan (RTPP). Mr. Kirby responded that the RTPP process is 18 months underway and the DOT has yet to establish performance measures, thus, they may not be similar. The DOT performance measures will be national broad brush measures.

Mr. Kellogg expressed concern that a national congestion measure could not be a one size fits all measure.

Ms. Inman mentioned the Virginia Trans2035 project and its goals and performance measures. She also commented on administration changes and the timing of the guidance from MAP-21. She noted the Virginia Transportation Plan has a statewide database and a backlog of state of good repair projects. She expressed concern for setting targets under limited budgets. She also recommended that the TPB send a strong message that congestion is not a universal measure.

Mr. Kirby noted that these comments and issues are welcome and should be identified early, as TPB staff discuss them with the federal, state, and transit agencies the measures and target setting process.

7. Review of Draft FY 2014 Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP)

The Fiscal Year 2014 draft Commuter Connections Work Program (CCWP) was included in the meeting agenda packet. A PowerPoint presentation was distributed and given by Mr. Ramfos who gave an overview of Commuter Connections including program benefits and highlights of what is new with the program and budget as well as next steps for the CCWP.

Commuter Connections is a network of public and private transportation organizations, including COG/TPB, state funding agencies, and local organizations that all work together to help reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality in the region.

Commuter Connections benefits local jurisdictions by helping to manage and reduce congestion and improve air quality which will benefit commuters, businesses with goods movement and tourist travel. The program also assists jurisdictions with attracting and retaining employers. In turn, employers benefit through their recruitment efforts and improve their ability to retain employees. Commuter Connections also provides workers with more commuting options that lead to an improved quality of life through the reduction of stress, daily commuting costs, and the time it takes them to get to and from work.

Mr. Ramfos then showed a geographic map that outlined the service area of the Commuter Connections program services. The central service area is the Washington Region's 8-hour non-attainment area. The Guaranteed Ride Home (GRH) service area is much larger than the 8-hour non-attainment area for workers eligible for the GRH program, and even larger for workers who use Commuter Connections' ridematching services. A chart with American Community Survey Census rankings for carpools and transit use for MSA areas shows that the Washington DC region ranks 3rd in the nation in total percentage of carpools and transit users.

Total daily impacts of the Commuter Connections program for VT, VMT, NOx, and VOC were shown based on the results from the FY 2009-2011 Commuter Connections TERM Analysis report. Federal planning regulations require the TPB to approve a congestion management process (CMP) which includes Transportation Demand Management as part of the metropolitan transportation plan and Commuter Connections is the major demand management component of the region's CMP. Commuter Connections also provides transportation emission reduction measure benefits for inclusion in the air quality conformity determination approved by the TPB. This is part of the annual update of the region's CLRP and TIP. Impacts from the program may be needed to address future regional or national transportation green house gas emission

targets. Results from Commuter Connections program impacts may also be used in new Federal MAP-21 legislation performance measure requirements.

Next, Mr. Ramfos explained that Commuter Connections has been shown to be a highly cost-effective way to reduce vehicle trips (VT), vehicle miles of travel (VMT), and vehicle emissions associated with commuting in the region. The overall program's cost-effectiveness is based on the results of the Commuter Connections TERM Analysis for VT, VMT, NOx, and VOC.

Mr. Ramfos then showed the comparison of the FY 2013 CCWP budget to the proposed FY 2014 CCWP budget and stated that there are some slight variations for some of the program areas. He stated that there is a five percent decrease in the budget from FY 2013 mainly due to the fact that in FY 2013 there were significant data collection activities which will not be the case in FY 2014. The budget breakdown includes about 30% of the costs going to COG/TPB staff & overhead, 50% of the costs for private sector services, 9% of the costs are passed through to local jurisdiction TDM programs, and 11% of the costs are attributed to direct costs.

Next, The FY 2014 CCWP also has some new features and projects, including the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Commuter Connections program, the production of the final version of the 2013 State of the Commute survey report and preparation of a general public report, the final version of the 2013 GRH applicant survey reports for both the Washington and Baltimore regions, the implementation of the 2013 Bike to Work Day participant survey and production of a report, an analysis of the regional Employer Outreach database, employer Telework data collection, a draft of the 2012 – 2014 TERM Analysis Report, and an Employer Customer Satisfaction Survey and report.

Mr. Ramfos then discussed the next review and approval steps for the document.

Ms. Inman asked when the data collection activities would be for the State of the Commute survey. Mr. Ramfos stated that the survey was currently in the field.

8. Review of Draft FY 2014 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Mr. Miller distributed a draft of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for FY 2014 (July 1, 2013 through June 30, 2014). He said the final draft of the FY 2014 UPWP will be presented to the Committee for review at its March 1 meeting and to the TPB for approval at its March 20 meeting. He reviewed the overall budget estimates and said that at this point there is considerable uncertainty due to the lack of Congressional action regarding the USDOT FY 2013 budget with MPO planning funding from MAP-21. He explained that we have assumed that the FY 2014 funding allocations to be provided by DOTs will be the same as the current FY 2013 levels. In addition, the budget estimate

assumes the level of unobligated funds from FY 2012 will be the same as the unspent funds from FY 2011. As in past years, the TPB will be asked to amend the budget in the fall once the final FY 2014 funding allocations are determined.

Mr. Miller briefly highlighted the work activities that include new text to describe how we will respond to the new MPO planning requirements and new programs in MAP-21. He mentioned that as Mr. Kirby discussed under agenda Item 6, the major modification to the metropolitan planning process calls for MPOs to establish and use a performance-based approach to transportation decision making and development of transportation plans. He referred to the Introduction beginning on page 3 in the document and the CLRP (page 31) and TIP (page 28) work activities which describe how performance measures and targets are to be established by the USDOT, the states, transit providers and MPOs, and the two-year time line to set the metropolitan targets. He said that under these activities, TPB staff will coordinate with the three state DOTs on their measures and targets to ensure consistent measures that are relevant for the TPB planning area. TPB staff will then coordinate with DOT staffs, WMATA and other transit providers to set targets. The new TIP and 2014 CLRP will include a description of the measures and targets under development or to be used in assessing the performance of the transportation system.

He pointed to the other work activities in the document that describe how they will contribute to developing the new performance measures and targets. These activities (beginning on page 42) include: Congestion Management Process; Management, Operations and ITS Planning; Transportation Safety Planning; Freight Planning; and Regional Bus Planning. He said that the proposed TPB role in the new MAP-21 Transportation Alternatives Program is described in the Transportation/Land Use Connection Program activity (page 39), and its proposed role in the new Section 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program is described in the Human Service Transportation Coordination activity (page 51).

Mr. Erenrich commented on the MAP-21 national goal regarding economic vitality and inquired whether we should consider doing some type of study on the region's economic development and strengths.

Mr. Kirby replied that Goal 5 is addressing the national freight network and that we will need to focus on choke-points and interstate congestion in our region.

Mr. Verzosa commented that these new performance based planning requirements may be hard to do without additional resources.

Mr. Kirby said that we have performance measure activities now so this is not totally new and we will draw on our current work. As it becomes clearer in the next year what work is required, we will refocus the current activities and if necessary shift some resources in the program.

Mr. Miller said that the first draft of the full document will be presented to the TPB at its February 20 meeting, and noted that the technical assistance programs for the DOTs and WMATA remain to be specified. He explained that some portions of the current work activities will be identified in March for carryover into FY 2014. The TPB will be asked to adopt the program on March 20 and then it will be submitted to FHWA and FTA for approval by July 1.

9. Update on the Second TPB Bus on Shoulder Task Force Meeting

Mr. Miller distributed a memorandum from Mr. Randall which provided an update on the Bus on Shoulder Task Force and its second meeting which was held prior to the January 23rd TPB meeting. He referred to the memo on the selected corridors for preliminary analysis in Maryland and Virginia. He summarized the topics in the presentations at the meeting by VDOT and the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA). He concluded by stating that the final meeting of the task force is scheduled for April 17 prior to the TPB meeting that day.

Chair Erickson said there was a Maryland State policeman at the meeting. She commented that it was a very informative meeting with good discussion among the task force members. She said that SHA is focusing on developing a scope on what steps and resources would be required to complete the feasibility steps for the Maryland corridors.

10. Update on the TPB Regional “Complete Streets” Policy and “Green Streets” Discussions

Mr. Farrell presented, referring to presentation slides. The TPB adopted the regional Complete Streets Policy in May 2012, which provided a definition of Complete Streets, a policy template for the reference of member agencies and jurisdictions, and follow-on actions for TPB staff including surveying members on their activities, keeping a regional database, creating a regional information clearinghouse, and sponsoring training. These activities are ongoing and on schedule.

A Complete Streets training workshop had just been held on January 29, 2013. The workshop featured panelists from the three state DOTs, Arlington County, Prince George's County, and COG/TPB to discuss implementation experiences. Attendance was about 50 participants, plus the panelists, including a mix of public agency planners, engineering staffs or consultants, and persons from nonprofits and the general public.

Mr. Farrell noted some highlights from the January 29 workshop. His presentation at the workshop noted the results of COG/TPB's survey, including the significant number of Complete Streets policies that have been adopted or updated in the region, as well as experiences reported in the survey about the development and adoption of those

policies. All three states and most of the inner jurisdictions now have Complete Streets policies. The workshop presentation from Ms. Engelhart of VDOT noted the importance of top-down support of policy implementation, as well as the time, steps, and refinements needed over the years to ensure bicycle and pedestrian accommodation is considered throughout VDOT's processes. Mr. Kuzan's presentation highlighted Maryland SHA's considerations over the years of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, building toward their 2012 adoption of a Complete Streets policy.

Mr. Sebastian's presentation noted DDOT's long emphasis on bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, leading to their 2010 adoption of a Complete Streets policy. Mr. Viola's presentation covered Arlington County's Complete Streets policy as part of the County Master Transportation Plan; they are working hard to retrofit existing streets. Mr. Wilson of the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation presentation focused on their Ager Road Diet project; the County's new combined Complete Streets and Green Streets policy was also noted.

Mr. Farrell turned to the letter the TPB had received on December 19, 2012 from the Anacostia Watershed Restoration Partnership requesting that the TPB adopt a regional Green Streets Policy similar to the May 2012 Complete Streets Policy, with the new Prince George's policy cited as an example. This had been the subject of a discussion at the January 11 TPB Technical Committee meeting, with a resulting suggestion of planning a Green Streets stakeholders workshop. The topic has also been discussed at the January 22 Bicycle and Pedestrian Subcommittee meeting as well as the January 29 State Technical Working Group meeting, as well as discussions between COG transportation planning and environmental programs staff. Planning was underway to hold a stakeholders' workshop with key transportation and environmental program representatives, date to be determined, likely in late February.

Chair Erickson noted that she had attended the January 29 Complete Streets workshop, and that the room was packed with people interested in the topic.

11. Briefing on a Summary Guide for the FY 2013-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Mr. Austin spoke to a presentation on the charts presented in the Summary Guide to the FY 2013-2018 TIP. The charts illustrated how funding in the TIP is broken down by source, fiscal year, project type, jurisdiction or agency, and construction phase. The charts also included a breakdown of funding in the TIP by new construction projects, maintenance and rehabilitation projects, and others (operational programs, purchases, trainings, etc.)

Mr. Malouff asked if the state portions of the funding chart included federal pass-through funding. Mr. Miller replied that it did not.

Several Committee members expressed concern that the tables showing a breakdown of projects by quantity were misleading. Mr. Erenrich pointed out that WMATA's section only contains 13 projects, but that those are actually categories and groupings of a much larger number of more detailed projects. Chair Erickson also pointed out that the footnote referring to VDOT and bike/ped projects should also apply to MDOT. Mr. Erenrich suggested incorporating an explanation of project grouping in the TIP into the Summary Guide.

Mr. Verzosa asked what the source of funding was for the FHWA and FTA matching portions of the charts. Mr. Austin replied this was mostly state and local funding. Mr. Verzosa noted that this made state and local funding about 50% of the funding in the TIP.

Mr. Brown and Ms. Backmon inquired about the ability to search for VDOT's grouped projects online. Mr. Austin replied that VDOT had not yet made the grouped listings available in a database format that could be incorporated into a searchable feature.

Mr. Austin asked that any further comments be submitted by February 8.

12. Briefing on TPB Staff Participation at the 2013 Transportation Research Board (TRB) Annual Meeting

Mr. Moran distributed two handouts: 1) copies of his PowerPoint presentation, and 2) a memo, written by Mr. Kirby and Mr. Pu, dated 1/23/13, entitled "TPB Staff Participation at the 2013 Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting."

The TRB Annual Meeting is held every year in January in Washington, D.C. and lasts about 4½ days. This year's meeting, the 92nd, was attended by about 11,000 people and included about 4,100 scheduled presentations and papers. TPB staff participated in the annual meeting in one or more of the following ways: 1) Presentations made by TPB staff; 2) TPB staff membership on TRB standing committees, which typically meet at the annual meeting; 3) TPB staff attendance at one or more sessions and/or committee meetings.

TPB staff made 9 presentations and serve on 11 TRB standing committees. Mr. Moran briefly described some of the TPB staff presentations and listed the committee membership. Given the large number of presentations attended by TPB staff, Mr. Moran chose to highlight just two presentations, as a representative sample. There were no questions for Mr. Moran.

13. Other Business

None.

14. Adjourn